UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY OOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/427,938	10/27/1999	JOHN S. HENDRICKS	026880.00004	3963

4372 7590 01/31/2007	EXAMINER
ARENT FOX PLLC 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20036	MEUCCI, MICHAEL O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	

SHORTENEO STATUTORY PERIOO OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/31/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/427,938	HENDRICKS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael D. Meucci	2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONEO (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>10 October 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-79</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>29-79</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>27 October 1999</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

·   DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the request for reconsideration filed 10 October

2006.

2.   Claims 1-79 are currently pending. Of these claims, 29-79 are currently

withdrawn from consideration.

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   The information disclosure statement filed 10 October 2006 fails to comply with

the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because there is no statement

disclosing: (1) That each item of information contained in the information disclosure

statement was first cited in any communication from a foreign patent office in a

counterpart foreign application not more than three months prior to the filing of the

information disclosure statement; or (2) That no item of information contained in the

information disclosure statement was cited in a communication from a foreign patent

office in a counterpart foreign application, and, to the knowledge of the person signing

the certification after making reasonable inquiry, no item of information contained in the

information disclosure statement was known to any individual designated in § 1.56(c)

more than three months prior to the filing of the information disclosure statement (see

37 CFR 1.97(e)). It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred

to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date

of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure

statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for

purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing

the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR

1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

4.   The examiner also points out that even if the IDS were compliant under 37 CFR

1.97(e), that many of the references listed on the IDS would not be considered. The

U.S. Patents and WIPO publications (English only) would be considered, but any EPO

and JPO documents provided that are not in the English language would not be

considered without a statement of relevance and either an English translation or an

English abstract. Also, the examiner points out that the CD containing the references

submitted on the IDS cannot be processed and scanned by the USPTO and therefore,

none of the prior art provided on the CD can be considered, particularly the non-patent

literature (NPL). Submission of hard copies of any NPL and foreign patent documents

is recommended.

Response to Amendment

5.   Examiner acknowledges amendments to correct antecedent basis issues with

claims 3, 5, 10, 17, 23, 25, 27, and 28. These rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second

paragraph have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7.   Claims 19-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

        a.   Claims 19-28 recite the limitation "the system" in line 1 of each claim.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Examiner believes

that applicant meant to specify --The computer system—for each of these claims.

Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public
> use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United
> States.

9.   Claims 1-3, 7, 10, 13, 18-22, 25, and 27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as

being anticipated by Fernandez (U.S. 4,855,725).

        a.   Regarding claim 1, Fernandez teaches: a main memory that stores

electronic books for delivery to the subscribers in the system and a queuing processor

coupled to the main memory that receives electronic book orders and determines a

queue location for an ordered electronic book (line 33 of column 6 through line 35 of

column 7 and Fig. 4-5); first queues that temporarily store first sections of electronic

books (lines 2-5 of column 7 and Fig. 4); and second queues that temporarily store

second sections of electronic books (lines 36-62 of column 7).

b.   Regarding claim 2, Fernandez teaches: the first and second queues each

comprise an on-demand first/second section queue and a popular content first/second

section queue (line 33 of column 6 through line 62 of column 7).

c.   Regarding claim 3, Fernandez teaches: a priority queue server coupled to

the first and second queues, wherein the server empties the first and the second

queues based on a priority model (lines 31-53 of column 8).

d.   Regarding claim 7, Fernandez teaches: searching queues for similar

electronic book orders; and broadcasting completed electronic book orders

simultaneously (lines 13-18 of column 3).

e.   Regarding claim 10, Fernandez teaches: an electronic book viewer, the

viewer comprising: a receiver that receives electronic books, a transmitter that transmits

electronic book orders, and a memory coupled to the receiver that stores the electronic

books; and a processor coupled to the receiver and the memory that controls

processing on the viewer, wherein the receiver receives broadcasts of first sections of

electronic books and stores the first sections in the memory (line 43 of column 2 through

line 35 of column 3and Fig. 3).

f.   Regarding claim 13, Fernandez teaches: the electronic books comprise an

electronic version of one or more of a printed book, a magazine, a catalog, a periodical,

and a newspaper (lines 63-67 of column 1).

g.   Claims 18-22, 25, and 27 contain substantially the same limitations as

those disclosed in claims 1-3, 7, 10, and 13 and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11.   Claims 4-5 and 23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Fernandez as applied to claim 3 above, in view of what is extremely well known in the

art at the time of the applicant's invention.

a.   Regarding claim 4, Fernandez teaches: emptying the on-demand first

section queue and emptying the popular content first section queue (lines 31-53 of

column 8). Fernandez does not explicitly teach: using a round robin manner to empty

the queues. However, Official Notice is taken of using a round robin manner to empty

the queues. A "round robin manner" as claimed is defined as taking turns, which is

inherent in this instance. This is clearly shown by Chen et al. (U.S. 6,611,531 B1)

hereinafter referred to as Chen on lines 45-50 of column 13 which describes priority

queuing. While Chen may or may not be considered prior art, the concept of taking

turns or any type of ordered control when deleting content is implicit.

b.   Regarding claim 5, Fernandez teaches: the priority model includes a

timing module, wherein the timing module determines a time an electronic book is

stored in the first and the second queues and wherein a maximum time is exceeded, the

server transmits the electronic book out of order (lines 31-50 of column 8).

c.   Claim 23 contains substantially the same limitations as those disclosed in

claims 4-5 and are rejected under the same rationale.

12.   Claim 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fernandez

as applied to claim 3 above, in view of Kigami et al. (JP04032497) hereinafter referred

to as Kigami.

a.   Regarding claim 6, Fernandez does not explicitly teach: determining a

length of a each queue; and transmitting an electronic book from a queue having a

longest length. However, Kigami discloses: "A detecting part 361 of a queue length

detection means 36 reads a queue length storing file 35, and an informing part 362 of

the means 36 informs a transaction inflow controller 2 of the queue length. This queue

length is compared with the largest queue length. If the former length is larger than the

latter one, a discriminating part 25 discriminates that the start of the transaction

processing is delayed. Meanwhile a message transmission part 27 sends the

information to a terminal computer 1 to show that the transaction data were not

received. When this information is received by a reception part 12 of the computer 1, an

output means 13 outputs the contents of the information to an output device 14,"

(Constitution of English Translation). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to determine queue lengths and

transmit an electronic book from a queue having a longest length. Obvious

combinations of the two references would be motivated in that the two are both dealing

with multiple queues and are clearly from the same field of endeavor. It is for this

reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would

have been motivated to determine queue lengths and transmit an electronic book from a

queue having a longest length in the system as taught by Fernandez.

13.   Claim 8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fernandez

as applied to claim 3 above, in view of Payton (U.S. 5,790,935).

        a.   Regarding claim 8, Fernandez does not explicitly teach: an internet

website; a web server coupled to the internet website; a delivery server coupled to the

web server; and a transaction server coupled to the web server, wherein the queuing

processor receives electronic book orders from the transaction server and the delivery

server receives ordered electronic books from the queue priority server. However,

Payton discloses: "As shown in FIG. 2, a virtual on-demand digital delivery system 22

includes a central distribution server 24, a high bandwidth digital transport system 26, a

local server 28 for each subscriber in the group; and a low bandwidth back channel 30.

The high bandwidth transport system 26 and the low bandwidth back channel 30 can be

replaced by a single bidirectional channel as shown in detail in FIG. 9. In response to a

subscriber's request, the delivery system 22 delivers the requested item to the

subscriber's playback device 32 such as a television, audio system or computer." (lines

45-54 of column 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the applicant's invention to have an internet website; a web server coupled to

the internet website; a delivery server coupled to the web server; and a transaction

server coupled to the web server, wherein the queuing processor receives electronic

book orders from the transaction server and the delivery server receives ordered

electronic books from the queue priority server. Obvious combinations of the two

references would be motivated in that the two are both dealing with serving electronic

book orders and are clearly from the same field of endeavor. It is for this reason that

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been

motivated to have an internet website; a web server coupled to the internet website; a

delivery server coupled to the web server; and a transaction server coupled to the web

server, wherein the queuing processor receives electronic book orders from the

transaction server and the delivery server receives ordered electronic books from the

queue priority server in the system as taught by Fernandez.

14.   Claim 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fernandez

as applied to claim 1 above, further in view of Himbeault et al. (U.S. 6,556,561 B1)

hereinafter referred to as Himbeault.

        Fernandez does not explicitly teach: a service time guarantee; and the processor

establishing a connection with the associated data processing system if the pending

service time exceeds the guaranteed service time guarantee. However, Himbeault

discloses: "As the maximum wait time is approached, the node forces a collision by

transmitting even though it senses another node is already transmitting to force the

network into a quiet mode. It then starts transmitting the real time data prior to other

nodes beginning transmission," (abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have a service time guarantee; and the processor establishing a

connection with the associated data processing system if the pending service time

exceeds the guaranteed service time guarantee. "A node on a collision detection

protocol based network forces collisions to gain control of the network when it has real

time data that needs to be transferred to another node on the network, and then begins

transmitting the real time data prior to other nodes gaining control of the network,"

(abstract of Himbeault). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have a service time

guarantee; and the processor establishing a connection with the associated data

processing system if the pending service time exceeds the guaranteed service time

guarantee in the system as taught by Fernandez.

15.   Claims 11 and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Fernandez as applied to claim 10 above, further in view of Kawakura et al. (U.S.

5,903,901) hereinafter referred to as Kawakura.

Fernandez does not explicitly teach: when a first section stored in the memory is

accessed or a link in the first section of the electronic book is accessed, the processor

generates an order for a corresponding second section, and the transmitter transmits

the order. However, Kawakura discloses: "According to one aspect of the present

invention there is provided a client device for acquiring and displaying hypermedia documents in a hypermedia document processing system, comprising: display means for interpreting and displaying a first page of the hypermedia documents acquired from one server; first transmission means for transmitting a first message requesting a second page of the hypermedia documents to be referred from the first page currently displayed by the display means to a request target server which stores the second page," (lines 6-15 of column 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have the processor generate an order for a corresponding second section and the transmitter transmits the order when a first section stored in the memory or a link in the first section of the electronic book is accessed. "It is another object of the present invention to provide a message transmission scheme and a relay server device capable of notifying an information concerning an anchor utilization to the source server, according to a page transfer record and a page request transfer record," (lines 1-5 of column 4 in Kawakura). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have the processor generate an order for a corresponding second section and the transmitter transmits the order when a first section stored in the memory or a link in the first section of the electronic book is accessed in the system as taught by Fernandez.

16.   Claims 14-17, 24, 26 and 28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fernandez as applied to claim 1 above further in view of Payton.

a.   Regarding claims 14-15, Fernandez does not explicitly teach: specified

books and first sections of specified books are broadcast on a cyclical basis. However,

Payton discloses: "As shown in FIG. 4, each local server's predictive filter 54 updates its

list 44 of recommended items in response to both a local periodic refresh via the

backchannel 30 (step 108) and a broadcast over the digital transport system 26 (step

110). In response to the periodic trigger, the local server 28 determines whether new

subscriber profile data or billing data exists (step 112)," (lines 61-67 of column 7). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's

invention to specify books and first sections of specified books broadcast on a cyclical

basis. "In response to a direct broadcast, the prediction filter 54 extracts the prediction

ratings changes and newly recommended items from the server 24 (step 120).

Thereafter, the prediction filter updates the list 44 of recommended items (step 122),"

(lines 5-10 of column 10 in Payton). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to specify books

and first sections of specified books are broadcast on a cyclical basis in the system as

taught by Fernandez.

b.   Regarding claim 16, Fernandez does not explicitly teach: (books) to be

broadcast are determined by reference to one of electronic books read data,

demographic data, and subscriber preferences. However, Payton discloses: "The

prediction filter also monitors the broadcast television programs viewed by the

subscriber and learns the subscriber's regular viewing habits to implement a "smart"

VCR. Well known neural network algorithms can be used to learn the subscriber's

viewing habits and to predict which programs are regularly viewed," (lines 37-43 of

column 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have broadcasts determined by reference to one of electronic

books read data, demographic data, and subscriber preferences. "If the received item

is a broadcast television signal it will not be on the subscriber's recommended list (step

136). In step 144, the filter determines whether the smart VCR is enabled and whether

the item is on the subscriber's regular viewing list. If so, the filter deletes the lowest

priority item (step 140) and routes it to the local storage (step 130)," (lines 43-49 of

column 8 in Payton).It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have broadcasts determined by

reference to one of electronic books read data, demographic data, and subscriber

preferences in the system as taught by Fernandez.

      c.   Regarding claim 17, Fernandez teaches: a virtual on-demand menu (lines

40-50 of column 6). Fernandez does not explicitly teach: the menu broadcast with a

broadcast of one of an electronic book and a first section of an electronic book, wherein

the menu lists electronic books available on the system. However, Payton discloses:

"To request an item, the subscriber interface 58 displays the list 44 of recommended

items, their respective average ratings for the subscriber's group, and any comments on

the video display. The subscriber can either select one of the displayed items using the

control device or request a menu of the remaining available items. Alternately, the initial

menu might show all offerings with the recommended items highlighted," (lines 26-33 of column 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have the menu broadcast with a broadcast of one of an electronic book and a first section of an electronic book, wherein the menu lists electronic books available on the system. "By recommending the locally stored items to the subscriber and making them easy to select, the delivery system 22 reduces the probability that an on-demand request will be made from the central distribution server 24," (lines 33-36 of column 6 in Payton). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have the menu broadcast with a broadcast of one of an electronic book and a first section of an electronic book, wherein the menu lists electronic books available on the system in the system as taught by Fernandez.

d.   Claims 24, 26, and 28 contain substantially the same limitations as those disclosed in claims 14-17 and are rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

17.   Applicant's arguments filed 10 October 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive:

18.   (A)   Regarding claims 19-28, the applicant contends that the explicit

antecedent basis for a term is not always required. The examiner respectfully

disagrees.

As to point (A), the applicant argues that the claims should not necessarily be

rejected as indefinite unless the reference results in confusion. The examiner contends

that the use of "the system" in the preamble of claims 19-28 in fact does cause

confusion because no generic "system" was disclosed in the independent claims. In

these instances, the limitations are indefinite because it is unclear whether "the system"

in each of these claims is supposed to refer to "the *computer* system" as recited in claim

18 or a *newly recited* system in each of the dependent claims 19-28. Accordingly, the

rejection is maintained. Correction is required.

19.   (B)   Regarding claims 1 and 18, the applicant contends that Fernandez fails to

teach a queuing processor coupled to the main memory that receives electronic book

orders and determines a queue location for an ordered electronic book. The examiner

respectfully disagrees.

As to point (B), applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b)

because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable

invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably

distinguishes them from the references. The examiner points to lines 24-41 of column 9

in Fernandez which disclose: "The description has concentrated on a single CD book

interacting with a personal computer, but as mentioned earlier, it is possible for a

plurality of CD books to interact with a single personal computer as in a presentation or education type environment. In this case, each CD book is identified by a unique code number, and this code number is transmitted as a prefix to any transmission to the personal computer. The personal computer, in turn, temporarily stores the code number and formats its transmission with the code number as a prefix. In this way, the transmission request from the CD books and the responding transmissions to the CD books are identified and properly directed. Depending on the number of CD books, a multitasking/multiuser operating system may be employed on the personal computer in order to efficiently manage the transmissions between the personal computer and the several CD books being supported at one time." From this description, as well as the previously cited portions of Fernandez, it is clear that the art does teach a queuing processor coupled to the main memory that receives electronic book orders and determines a queue location for an ordered electronic book. These features as claimed are inherent in the Fernandez system because it is capable of handling multiple requests at any given time as disclosed in the cited portions above. As such, the rejection remains proper and is maintained by the examiner.

Conclusion

20.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

21.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Katsumata et al. (U.S. 4,272,819) discloses a system with queuing and dequeuing processors.

22.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Meucci at (571) 272-3892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell, can be reached at (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for this Group is 571-273-8300.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [michael.meucci@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a

possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record

includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35

U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published

in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG

89.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BEATRIZ PRIETO
PRIMARY EXAMINER